

REMARKS

Initially, applicants note with appreciation the indication of allowability of claims 5-10, 12 and 13, if rewritten in independent form. However, claim 4 of the application, on which these claims depend, directly or indirectly, is believed to be allowable for the reasons explained below.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP No. 2001-351950 (Toray) in view of USP No. 4,504,571 (Yamamura).

This rejection is not believed to be correct because the proposed modification of Toray cannot result in the method of the present invention for forming a circuit board.

First, the Office's interpretation of the reinforcing "film" D as being a reinforcing "plate" as required in the present invention is not reasonable. Claim terms must be interpreted so as to have a meaning consistent with the specification. It is clear from a comparison of the description of the prior art in the background section of the application with the description of the method of the invention that the specification uses the term "plate" to distinguish from a "film".

Second, claim 4 requires that the flexible film is peeled away from the reinforcing plate while a peel angle is being maintained

in the range of more than 0° to 80°. The Office has not shown how such an angle can be maintained during peeling with the use of a flexible reinforcing film as disclosed in Toray.

Third, notwithstanding the insufficiencies of Toray as explained above, claim 4 has been amended to recite that the reinforcing plate has dimensional stability and to limit said reinforcing plate to "an inorganic glass selected from the group consisting of soda-lime glass, borosilicate glass, and quartz glass; a ceramic selected from the group consisting of alumina, silicon nitride, and zirconia; a metal plate where the metal is selected from the group consisting of stainless steel, invar alloy and titanium; or a glass-fiber reinforced resin sheet." This amendment is supported by the description in the specification of the present application on page 12, lines 3-8.

The reinforcing plate made of a material having dimensional stability as defined in claim 4 distinguishes over the reinforcing film D of Toray which does not have dimensional stability.

Yamamura does not overcome the deficiencies of Toray to support the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection. The method of Yamamura comprises the step of "peeling away the transparent support and the unexposed areas of the photopolymerizable composition layer from the substrate to retain the exposed areas of the photopolymerizable

OCT 14 2008

PATENT APPLN. NO. 11/474,427  
RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.111


PATENT  
NON-FINAL

composition layer on the substrate" (column 2, lines 47-51). The purpose of Yamamamura is to form sharp image lines on the the substrate by peeling (column 2, line 69). On the other hand, in the present invention, a flexible film having a circuit pattern is peeled from reinforcing pate while a peel angle is being maintained in the range of more than 0° to 80° in order not to cause bending of the flexible film at a peel point (page 39, lines 5-7). Nothing in Yamamura suggests the modifications to the different method of Toray required to obtain the method of the present invention.

The foregoing is believed to be a complete and proper response to the Office Action dated June 11, 2008.

In the event that this paper is not considered to be timely filed, applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fee for any such extension and any additional required fees may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 111833.

Respectfully submitted,  
KUBOVCIK & KUBOVCIK



Ronald J. Kubovcik  
Reg. No. 25,401

Crystal Gateway 3  
Suite 1105  
1215 South Clark Street  
Arlington, VA 22202  
Tel: (703) 412-9494  
Fax: (703) 412-9345  
RJK/KTK/ff